# HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 50 Saturday, December 15, 1956 Washington, D. C.

**News Section** *Printed in Two Sections*

**Decision at Gettysburg:** What will come out of the parley at the Gettysburg farm between the President and Nehru is anxiously discussed along Washington's diplomatic row, and whatever the public communiqués may declare, those who are concerned with foreign policy here will continue to seek information on "secret agreements," if any.

As observers foresee it this weekend, Nehru will offer proposals for a settlement of Far East problems, and not even the most cautious attaché in the Capital's diplomatic quarter doubts that these suggestions arose from a meeting between Nehru and Red China Premier Chou En-lai in New Delhi last week.

The proposals — it is believed — will be (1) that the U.S. consent to an early meeting "somewhere in Asia" between Chou En-lai and Secretary of State Dulles, and (2) that the U.S. embargo on goods to Red China be lifted. If the U.S. makes concessions on these points, then the next long-range step would be an arrangement for the liquidation of Free China on Formosa and Free Korea under Syngman Rhee.

But the two primary Red Chinese demands must be met, "or else" — such is the attitude of Peiping, according to authoritative sources. The "or else" is said to mean: if they are not accepted an almost immediate attack by Red Chinese forces on Formosa and Korea would follow. An impressive build-up of military strength on the Red side in both these areas has been reported recently.

What will the President decide after listening to Nehru? Few here venture a definite guess. But those who fear appeasement note with concern a report that in all likelihood a third person will sit in on the private talks between the two leaders at Gettysburg. The "third man" — as it is now reported in advance — will be Dr. Milton Eisenhower. The President's brother has long been regarded in the Capital as associated with the appeasement wing of the Palace Guard.

It is also reported: after strong hints from Nehru that he would like to see the President *without* the presence of Secretary of State Dulles and the pro-Chiang Assistant Secretary Walter Robertson, the President agreed to have the *tete-à-tete* with Nehru at Gettysburg. Mr. Dulles is not slated to be in Gettysburg at all. It should be recalled that Nehru and Dulles have scarcely seen eye to eye on U.S. policy towards Red China in the past. Mr. Robertson has conveniently left the U.S. for a tour of inspection in the Far East, not to return until after the departure of Nehru.

Meanwhile, not only Washington, but Red Asia, awaits impatiently word from Gettysburg. Reportedly Chou En-lai has arranged to go to New Delhi, when Nehru gets back to his capital, to hear how the Red Chinese proposals — and threats — were received in Gettysburg.

**Herter:** Appointment of Governor Christian Herter to succeed Herbert Hoover, Jr., as Under Secretary of State, although not unexpected, inspires lively dismay among Capital conservatives. One GOP Senator characterized the appointment as "terrible." This feeling is accentuated since it is believed that Secretary of State Dulles will resign in the near future, and Herter will move up to take the reins.

If this happens — it is thought here — the State Department will veer perceptibly to the left, particularly on such matters as foreign aid. Herter is deemed to be pliable under left-wing pressure — which comes constantly from the old Acheson-type bureaucrats in the State Department — and on foreign aid he is considered to be "more royalist than the king."

An astonishing speech Herter made before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, last March 15, is cited as support for this characterization. In that speech, Herter went down the line with all the more ultra-"liberal" slogans on foreign aid ("we should not demand any *quid pro quo* for our assistance"). He then moved out in front by offering a proposal considered more radical than anything ever suggested by Chester Bowles or the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ADA. America, Herter said, should pool its foreign aid program with that of Communist Russia:

> **". . . we should offer to coordinate our aid with whatever assistance the Soviet Union is willing to provide. If the Soviet proposes to build a steel mill, we should not feel bound to offer to build the same mill on more favorable conditions. We should, on the contrary, be willing to work out both with the Soviet and with the recipient country a program to which both the Soviet and ourselves can each contribute."**

**Voice from the Hinterland:** The Capital notes with keen interest a very eloquent speech made early this week to "leaders of the hinterland" by one of the most influential GOP Senators from the "grass roots." The speech was made at Miami, December 11, before 6,000 delegates to the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, by Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire. The Farm Bureau Federation is the largest and strongest farm organization in the country, is conservative (in contrast to the Farmers Union which is leftist), and generally supports the Eisenhower Administration's policies.

Bridges spoke on foreign policy. He charged that although the United Nations had been firm in demanding that the British and French withdraw their troops from the Suez Canal Zone, it was "weak and vacillating when the Russians and their puppet Government . . . refuse to allow United Nations observers to enter Hungary." Bridges added, "I personally believe that the United Nations should go all-out in the strongest measures at its command."

He asked: "How long are we going to allow a tyranny by the minority in the United Nations? How long are we going to allow the Soviets, supported by the so-called neutralists, to use the United Nations for the purpose of dividing the free world and, at the same time, not allow the U.N. to take any action which is in conflict with the totalitarian self interests?" Bridges concluded by calling for a "very precise re-examination" of U.S. foreign policy.

Reports from Miami say that the Bridges speech was enthusiastically applauded and that the Senator was given a standing ovation by the audience at the close of the address.

**Dewey in 1960:** Tex McCrary, radio personality, an original Ike supporter and intimate of the White House inner circle, was asked after a recent address in Milwaukee "whether Dewey is dead politically."

Reply: "Not at all. Tom Dewey will be Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense and he will be the GOP nominee in 1960."

Political sages think Dewey's choice will be Defense — where less dangerous political issues have to be faced.

Dewey recently was asked why he did not join with the Palace Guard movement to ditch Nixon last spring. He reportedly answered that he thinks his participation would have killed Nixon, but — he added — to do so would have killed his own chances in 1960!

Dewey recognizes the odds against him, but does not want to kill whatever chance remains.

**BOUND VOLUMES for 1956** — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; **pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.** A few indexed bound volumes for 1955 are available at $15. None available for previous years.

**Britain's Hour of Need:** "The special financial and economic difficulties with which England is faced at the present time have placed the entire economic program of the United States in jeopardy. England has an important place in the world economy. Her economy is geared to world trade to a degree unequalled by any other nation of comparable size. England is the world's greatest importer, accounting before the war for about one-fifth of the world's imports. But Britain's influence extends far beyond her own trade. The countries having close trade and currency relations with Britain together account for 55 per cent of world imports and nearly 50 per cent of world exports."

This quoted passage happens to have been written ten years ago. It is from House Report No. 2289 of June 14, 1946. But it might have been written this week. Britain faced a financial crisis then, it faced one last week, and it has faced others in the intervening decade. Bretton Woods, the British Loan and surplus property deal, Interim Aid, the Marshall Plan and the European Pay-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments Union, and latterly, NATO — all of these sources of U.S. help seem but to have assisted the British Empire stagger a few more steps under the burdens of the welfare state at home and far-flung commitments abroad.

**Who Pays for the Suez War:** Britain has decided that, under the terms of the 1946 loan agreement, it is entitled to waive the interest installment of $81,600,000 due to the U.S. Treasury December 31, 1956. In the terms of the loan agreement, "waive" means cancel. Thereby a large part — the proverbial lion's share — of the $99,000,000 cost of Britain's invasion of Egypt is assigned to the U.S. to pay.

**Civil Rights:** The preliminary jockeying for position in the promised fight by northern "liberals" for revision of Senate rules to facilitate gagging of filibusters — an essential prerequisite to passage of any so-called "civil rights" legislation — produces many interesting and ironic developments.

Item: Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, only a few weeks ago a darling and a hero of the "liberal"-left, suddenly becomes a spineless weakling in their eyes. His crime: a statement praising Senate Democratic Floor Leader Lyndon Johnson and decrying leftist efforts to have Johnson removed from his leadership post during the filibuster rule fight. "Liberal" pundit Thomas L. Stokes, for example, bemoans the disappearance of "the alluring vision of the young figure fighting his party leaders."

Item: Even Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, a founding father of Americans for Democratic Action and one of the six ADA Senators who originally demanded the filibuster rule revision, gets similar treatment for saying kind words about Johnson. Stokes accuses Humphrey of softening his stand after a phone call from the Texan.

Item: Senator Charles Potter of Michigan, World War II hero who a few years ago was regarded as one of the more conservative of all Senators, announces he will go along with the ADA sextet in seeking to provide a means of stopping filibusters. By coincidence, Potter happens to come up for re-election in 1958; Negroes comprise a considerable segment of the population in Michigan, particularly in the Detroit area.

**NEA:** The "progressive"-minded National Education Association (NEA) comes up with a neat method of clearing its skirts on two counts — integration and Federal control of local schools.

A conference of its state and national legislative officials decided this week that the 1957 Federal school-aid legislation should not contain any provision to force integration compliance because that would contradict "the principle of Federal aid without Federal control."

Virtually unanimous Capital opinion is that the real reason for the NEA's opposition to any no-segregation clause is its realization that, with any such rider, the legislation will be dead.

Such being the case — it is observed — the NEA simply chose this subject as the vehicle on which to reaffirm its professed opposition to any Federal control of local school systems. Fear of such ultimate Federal domination is one of the biggest reasons for the widespread opposition to the Federal aid theory.

The prevailing belief is that when and if the legislation is passed, the NEA opposition to Federal interference will evaporate and it will seek to use the U.S. Office of Education, which it effectively dominates, to impose its "progressive education" theories on reluctant local school boards.

**Union Logic:** Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, told this week's annual conference of the UAW skilled trades members that the union is aiming for its biggest wage increase in history in 1958.

He said expiration of big contracts in the automotive, aircraft and farm implement industries makes 1958 "the year of the great challenge" for the UAW, and that "the most ambitious program we ever drafted" will be backed to the hilt by the strike weapon; "unless you have power behind eloquence and facts, you might as well not come to the bargaining table."

Curiously, the UAW and organized labor generally have been complaining bitterly in recent weeks about inflationary trends, real and threatened.

Three days before Reuther's bellicose talk, the *AFL-CIO News*, official weekly paper of the parent union organization, carried a front-page headlined story complaining about the one-half per cent increase in the maximum allowable interest rate on FHA-insured housing loans.

The same front page carried a story headlined, "Auto Workers Ask Ike Push Profit Probe." The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

story quotes Reuther as denying categorically that wage increases have contributed to the inflationary process.

Economists search in vain for justification for the UAW President's contention or for his bland declaration that his union can win "the most ambitious program we ever drafted" without contributing substantially to the inflation cycle about which the unions complain.

**Red Constitution:** A revised draft constitution for the U.S. Communist party, reported in the *Daily Worker* December 10, is seen as intensifying the Reds' current "united front" drive, in which they seek to merge their efforts with other left-wing groups — up to and including the Democratic party. (The *Worker* gave vociferous support to Adlai Stevenson in the past election.)

In the preamble to the new constitution, the Communists claim to uphold "the achievements of American democracy" and to defend "the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights against those who would destroy democracy." The preamble also states:

> **"The Communist Party holds that there are various roads to socialism and that the working people of our nation will find their own road to socialism. We advocate a peaceful, democratic road to socialism through the political and economic struggles of the American people within the developing constitutional process."**

Monitors of the Red line say that this declaration serves two purposes for the Communists: (1) it puts them squarely behind Moscow's new theoretical line of "separate roads to socialism"; and (2) it helps to ease them out from under Smith Act prosecutions for advocating violent overthrow of the U.S. Government.

**Book Event:** *The Anti-Capitalistic Mentality*, by Ludwig von Mises; D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N. J.; $3.75

*Laissez faire* capitalism creates: (1) wealth and freedom; (2) passionate enemies. The world's greatest libertarian economist, Ludwig von Mises, here explains this apparent contradiction.

In "pre-capitalistic" (or "status") societies, where rank is ordained by birth, the "lower orders" accept their humble station because they hold it through no failing of their own. The main characteristic of *laissez faire* capitalism, on the other hand, is that society operates on a "contract," rather than a "status" basis, and rank (as represented by wealth) is determined by merit (service rendered to consumers). In such a society, those at the bottom — knowing they might have risen through merit — cannot accept the judgment of the market as easily as their predecessors accepted the accident of birth. They therefore blame the "system," and are ready to follow the demagogue who condemns it.

While this is the theme of his book, Dr. Mises' great learning does not allow him to limit himself merely to the psychological aspects of capitalism. *The Anti-Capitalistic Mentality* is also a lucid introduction to Dr. Mises' thought and the economics of the free market in general. Among its other good effects, this small book may stir readers to study Mises' two great works — *Socialism* and *Human Action.*

**Letter from TAYLOR CALDWELL, Noted Author of many best-selling novels:** "The man or woman who does not subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS is only half literate about the world today, for the newspapers will not, or dare not, publish the significant or disturbing events occurring in our country. *Since an unknown friend, and I do mean friend,* subscribed for a few issues of HUMAN EVENTS for me, I have eagerly awaited its arrival every week. Not only is the regular newssheet appallingly enlightening, but the articles accompanying it give an insight into the terrible doings of the enemies of America, thus alerting all patriotic citizens. As the Moslems say, 'A man armed with knowledge is a man armed.' And we need armed men these days."

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.**

**Yearly rate, $10;** 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

**By first class mail,** $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

**Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

**1955 Bound Annual Volume** with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

**The Declaration of Independence** opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
*Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIII, No. 50 HUMAN EVENTS December 15, 1956

**Article Section**

**The AFL-CIO, supported by Secretary of Labor Mitchell and the liberal Republican clique within the Administration, is planning a blitz during the early weeks of the 85th Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley provision permitting states to pass "right-to-work" laws. Write your Congressman asking how he will vote on such a proposal. Ask your state legislators for their stand on state "right-to-work" laws. Union leaders have already done most of the spade work to push through their program. Send each of your legislators a copy of this article. Act NOW!**

# THE COMING ATTACK
## On "Right-to-Work" Laws

*By* J. C. GIBSON

WHEN THE Norris-LaGuardia Act was passed in 1932, it contained a provision saying that the workingman should have the right of choice to belong or not to belong to a labor union. This declaration of policy reads, in part: "Though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing . . . 23 U.S.C., 102" The Act bore the name of two of the most prominent liberals in Congress, and it received widespread acclaim by liberals and labor leaders as a milestone in the advance of liberalism, and indeed as the Magna Carta of labor.

Since "right-to-work" laws, embracing substantially the same provisions, began to be passed by the states some 12 or 14 years later, they have been denounced by labor leaders and so-called liberals as manifestations of the blackest form of reaction.

This shift in position evidences one of the strangest paradoxes in the history of the labor movement in the United States. The present insistence of George Meany and Walter Reuther on compulsory union membership is in vivid contrast with the espousal of freedom of choice of the individual, in matters of this kind, by labor leaders of an earlier day. Samuel Gompers, father of the modern American labor movement, preached voluntarism. In a speech at El Paso, Texas, in 1924, he declared:

> **"Men and women of our American trade union movement, I feel that I have earned the right to talk plainly with you. . . . I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty — the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible."**

"Right-to-work" laws extend specific protection to freedom of choice. Their common pattern protects the right to join, as well as the right not to join, a union. But most of the leaders of the powerful national unions want to destroy this freedom of choice. For the right to join or not to join a union they would substitute an absolute duty to join. Their objective has no parallel in our American way of life.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They made this objective plain before the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Lincoln Union* case in 1949, when they boldly asserted that "right-to-work" laws interfered with the proper prerogatives of the labor union. They claimed that the union has, in a sense, the powers of government. The American Federation of Labor, in its brief in that case, said:

> **"The common rule of collective bargaining carries with it the legal doctrine that the union is the common authority for government of a society of workers. It has in a sense the powers and responsibilities of a government."**

This argument, that the union is a state within a state, is apparently what the Court had in mind in characterizing some of the contentions of the unions as "startling," and in rejecting the claim that "right-to-work" laws offend against constitutional principles.

IF A MAN may be compelled to join a labor union, where are we to draw the line? What other private organizations may conscript members? What would prevent those in power from dictating to every citizen what political party, fraternity, club or even what church he should join? Would not this theory, carried to its logical conclusion, pave the way for a one-party state?

The laws in question are intended to implement two fundamental principles of human liberty long recognized in the laws of the United States and Western Europe: the "right-to-work" and freedom of association.

The "right to work" of which I speak is not a guaranty of employment in a particular job by a paternalistic system controlling all of the means of production. That is the Marxian concept, but it is not ours. In its American sense the term signifies the inherent right of every man to an opportunity to seek and retain the gainful employment which he desires, and which is available in our economy, free from arbitrary interference.

Freedom of association is the bulwark of a host of voluntary relationships that play so large a role in the social, economic, and political life of the American people. It is the principal legal basis for the recognition of the right to organize labor unions. When labor leaders attempt to impose compulsory membership, they are in reality undermining the fundamental principle which secures the very existence of their organizations. What does freedom of association mean if a man can be forced to join a labor union as the price of holding his job?

Some working men and women want to join a union; others do not. In either event their choice should be respected, whether the reasons are good or bad. A union is seldom merely a collective bargaining representative. It is often also partly a political organization, partly a fraternal order, partly a social club, and partly an insurance society.

There are Communist unions in this country, and under compulsory union membership agreements hundreds of thousands of American citizens are being compelled to join them in order to hold a job and gain a livelihood. This is a clear abuse. The objections of a workingman to joining a Communist union obviously ought to be respected. But why should not other reasons for the exercise of free choice by the individual workingman also be respected? Suppose he objects to going into a socialist union? Suppose he objects to the political activities in which the union is plunged by its leadership, including the very common practice of using his dues to support candidates or parties he opposes? Suppose he objects to such things as sit-down strikes, mass picketing, violence and intimidation on and off the picket line, or racketeering, or preaching of class warfare?

Without "right-to-work" laws, the workingman must either accept these invasions of his rights, or lose his job. With "right-to-work" laws, his rights and his job are protected. Why, then, are these statutes the subject of such bitter controversy?

A number of grounds are commonly brought forward to justify compulsory unionism, and to excuse disregard of the "right to work."

Foremost, perhaps, is the plea that the union shop is merely a voluntary agreement between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

private parties. This argument is specious. Labor relations today are so regulated by law that compulsory union membership is ordinarily possible only with Governmental assistance, or at least only with the Government's permission. It is usually imposed by union leaders, who use as a weapon the great complex of powers placed in their hands by modern labor law, and more often than not enjoy the assistance of Governmental pressure. To suppose that agreements for compulsory union membership made under these conditions represent purely private action is to embrace fiction in preference to reality. President Roosevelt declared in 1941 that, under his leadership, the Government would never compel employees to join a union by official decree. "That," he insisted, "would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor." But these are the methods which in substance and effect are being employed today when compulsory union membership is authorized by law, and put in force by labor leaders exercising tremendous powers granted them by law.

THE UNION SHOP is not a voluntary arrangement in any true sense. The great majority of employers in the country are opposed to any form of compulsory union membership. Many of them have nevertheless agreed to it under coercion by labor leaders through strikes or threats of strikes. Where the ruling influence is coercion, freedom of contract is a mockery. What the proponents of the union shop desire is observance, not of freedom of contract, but of freedom of coercion.

At one time the Supreme Court of the United States held freedom of contract with respect to union membership to be one of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. In the nineteen-thirties the Court reversed itself, sustaining the Wagner Act in outlawing contracts obligating workingmen not to join a union. In so holding it sustained the contention of labor leaders that such a contract violates the "right to work" and freedom of association.

The union has no right to represent the employees in such a way as to deprive them of fundamental liberties. The only purpose of an agreement for compulsory union membership is to override the "right to work" and the freedom of association of present or prospective members of the class or craft which the union represents. No right therefore can be said to inhere in two of the four parties—the employer and the union—to enter into such an agreement.

The unions also complain about what they call "free riders"—those workers who do not belong to a union but who are forced by law to have their wages, hours, and working conditions established by the union representing the workers in their craft or class. The unions argue that is it unfair to let any worker share in the results of union bargaining without bearing part of the expenses.

**But the unions themselves asked Congress for the power to represent and bind all employees in the bargaining unit, including those not union members. They saw how valuable this power to speak for non-members would be to them. It removes all competition and cements their monopoly position. They sought this power, knowing what obligations it entails, and their present complaint — that the immensely valuable privilege they obtained is actually a burden — rings hollow indeed.**

At best, the logic of the "free rider" argument would not compel a non-member to join a union, but only to pay for the services he gets. It would not require him to contribute to the union's other ventures, such as its political and fraternal activities, its insurance schemes, and its entertainments.

No private organization can claim compensation from those who have not sought and do not want its services. Forced payments are equivalent to taxes, and taxation is a sovereign power. It may be exercised only by the Government, and not by a labor union or any other type of private association.

There is, therefore, no reason why non-members should pay anything at all for the services of a union as collective bargaining representative. They do not actually get something for nothing. They pay for what they get when they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffer the detriment of being forced to surrender their right to bargain for themselves, and their right to be represented by a union of their own choice. In some cases, at least, they get the worst of the bargain.

The increases in wages in this country between 1935 and 1956 hardly came about altogether by virtue of union activity. Wages and standards of living have increased markedly since 1870, even in periods when unions exerted very little influence. A large part of the credit must go to our free institutions, to large capital investments, to scientific research, to inventions, labor-saving machinery, and better managerial techniques, to mention a few other factors resulting in the greater productivity of our economy.

**If labor unions were the dominating factors in creating these benefits, why is it that England, France, and other European countries, where labor unions experienced earlier and more powerful development, do not surpass us in material wealth?**

AS A LAST LINE of defense, opponents of "right-to-work" laws sometimes fall back on the "divine right of the majority." The principle of majority rule, however, cannot justify compulsory union membership. While it is appropriate in controlling the internal affairs of a Government agency or a private association, it cannot be invoked to force unwilling persons into *membership* in a private group. The Founding Fathers understood that majority rule may well lead to grave injustices unless it is coupled with adequate safeguards for the rights of minorities. The "right to work" and freedom of association are such fundamental rights.

All told, the number of working people who, for one reason or another, do not care to join or to remain members of a union is very large. In fact that is what has given rise to the whole "right-to-work" controversy.

**Labor leaders unwittingly prove this point themselves when they place such a high value upon compulsory membership as one of the leading weapons in their arsenal.**

"Right-to-work" laws are being introduced in several states and the unions are trying to effect repeals of such laws in a number of states which already have them. In addition, the unions have made it plain that they intend to make an all-out attack on the Taft-Hartley Act, so as to have it override the state laws. In these coming legislative battles the rights of the individual workingman will be faced with formidable opposition. The AFL and CIO were strong politically before their merger, and they are even stronger now. With some 15 million members, and an annual income from dues alone of no less than half-a-billion dollars, they are in a position to wield a powerful force.

But there is a way to meet that force and meet it effectively. In a word, it can be met through education — through education of our legislators and education of the voting public, with respect to the true meaning of the "right to work."

Any form of compulsory union membership is bad. But it is worse to give a big, modern, country-wide union a monopoly of employment in a great national industry. It gives the union an economic stranglehold dangerous to the public welfare. The danger would be multiplied if compulsory union membership should be enforced in all of the great industries of the United States; and it would be compounded if all of these great monopolistic unions should be banded together, with a few leaders, or a single leader, at their head. There would then exist a concentration of strength which could perhaps have an irresistible power over the economic and political affairs of this country.

---

*Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.*

---

J. C. Gibson is a Chicago attorney, experienced in labor law. His writings and talks on "right-to-work" laws are considered among the most authoritative in the field of labor analysis.

**HUMAN EVENTS** was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED